

On nonuniversal conductance quantization in high-quality quantum wires

Anton Yu. Alekseev^{*†}, Vadim V. Cheianov^{*†}

^{*} *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University, Box 803, S-75108, Uppsala, Sweden*

[†] *Steklov Mathematical Institute, Fontanka 27, 191011, St.Petersburg, Russia*

(December 1996)

We present a theoretical analysis of recent experimental results of Yacoby *et al.* on transport properties of high quality quantum wires. We suggest an explanation of observed deviations of the conductance from the universal value $2e^2/h$ per channel in the wire. We argue that at low temperatures and biases the deviation can be a consequence of anomalously enhanced backscattering of electrons entering the 2DEG from the wire and is not connected to intrinsic properties of 1DEG.

PACS numbers: 73.20.Dx, 73.23.Ad

Recently Yacoby *et al.* [1] presented measurements of conductance and differential conductance of high quality quantum wires prepared using cleaved edge overgrowth technique. Despite the recent predictions that conductance of a pure adiabatic quantum wire should be quantized in units of $2e^2/h$ independently of interaction strength in 1DEG, Yacoby *et al.* observed conspicuous deviations from the predicted universality. Their experimental results can be summarized as follows:

(1) At low temperature as the Fermi energy in the wire is varied the dc conductance shows a number of plateaus separated by the steps of approximately the same value

$$G = 2g \frac{e^2}{h}, \quad (1)$$

where $g < 1$ is a temperature dependent factor which varies from sample to sample and which may be as low as 0.75.

(2) As temperature is increased (from $0.3K$ up to $25K$) higher plateaus disappear while the factor g for lower plateaus monotonically increases and approaches 1.

(3) The differential conductance of the wire monotonically increases with applied bias and for sufficiently strong biases (about 7 mV) exceeds the universal value $2e^2/h$.

(4) Independence of the conductance on the plateau of Fermi energy, rigid rise of plateaus when temperature is varied as well as the measurements of the conductance dependence on the length of the wire suggest that there is no disorder induced backscattering in the wire which might be responsible for the reduced value of conductivity.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest an explanation of these experimental data. We believe that two different effects are encountered which should be considered separately. The first effect is responsible for reduced values of the dc conductance at low temperatures and of the differential conductance at low biases. In our opinion, it is not related to the properties of 1DEG but rather is a consequence of anomalously enhanced backscattering of electrons in 2DEG. Only this effect will be considered in the present paper.

The second effect manifests itself in the differential conductance on a plateau in a strongly biased quantum wire exceeding the universal value $2e^2/h$. We do not consider this effect in the paper.

In the absence of impurity backscattering the conductance of a noninteracting 1DEG is given by the Landauer-Büttiker formula [2]

$$G = 2 \frac{e^2}{h}. \quad (2)$$

The factor of 2 accounts for two spin orientations of electrons. It is believed that at low temperatures and low biases the same universal result (2) holds true in the interacting 1DEG [3]. In the derivation of the universal conductance formula it is assumed that electrons leaving the wire be irreversibly absorbed by the leads. In our opinion, this condition is not satisfied in experiments performed by Yacoby *et al.*

The quantum wire of [1] is formed by edge states at the boundary of the 2DEG. At some segment of the boundary the 2DEG is depleted by applying the gate voltage and thereby is decoupled from the edge states. It is this segment of the boundary that models a quantum wire. However, the edge states extend along the whole length of the boundary. In an ideal system the edge states would be orthogonal to the 2DEG states in the bulk. Thus, if we had applied a bias voltage to the 2DEG leads of such a system, there would have been no current at all. Of course, in the experimental device the 1DEG formed by edge states in the leads (outside the true quantum wire region) is strongly coupled to the 2DEG in the bulk. This coupling is modeled by inserting randomly distributed scattering centers at the boundary.

The model suggested in [1] introduces a possibility of backscattering in the edge channels and, presumably, scattering from one edge channel to another. The authors of [1] introduce two coefficient Γ_{2D} and Γ_{BS} characterizing the rate of scattering to the 2DEG and of backscattering to the edge states. Then by solving the Boltzman equation they show that the conductance is reduced

$$G = \frac{2e^2}{h} \left(1 + \frac{2\Gamma_{BS}}{\Gamma_{2D}} \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (3)$$

In our model we assume that the backscattering to the edge states can be neglected $\Gamma_{BS} \approx 0$. The reason is as follows. The region of the true quantum wire where the 1DEG is decoupled from the 2DEG is quite small. It was shown experimentally that the quantum wire is shorter than the mean free path of an electron. So, we can neglect the impurity scattering in this region. In the region where the edge states are strongly coupled to the 2DEG the electron-electron interaction is irrelevant [3]. If there had been some substantial backscattering into the edge states in this region the conductance would have been reduced by a temperature independent factor. The experiment [1] shows a strong temperature dependence of the conductance. Therefore, we conclude that the backscattering into the edge states is not responsible for the conductance reduction.

Now choose a particular mode α in edge states. It is coupled to two 2DEG leads. As we neglect electron-electron interaction in 1DEG, we can consider the wave function of a particular electron leaving the quantum wire. It propagates along the edge and is scattered to the 2DEG by the scattering centers. The i th scattering center produces a contribution to the electrons wave function in the 2DEG region

$$\psi = A_i^\alpha \psi_p^{\text{in}}(\rho, \theta). \quad (4)$$

Here we denote by $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ the distance from the scattering center, the x -axis is orthogonal and the y -axis is parallel to the edge of the sample, the origin of the coordinate system is placed at the scattering center, θ is the angle between the direction of the radius vector ρ and the x -axis. The wave function $\psi_p^{\text{in}}(\rho, \theta)$ is normalized so as to correspond to the unit incident flux and can be approximated by its asymptotic expansion

$$\psi_p^{\text{in}}(\rho, \theta) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \frac{e^{ip\rho}}{\rho^{1/2}} \cos \theta. \quad (5)$$

Later we will argue why only this long distance asymptotics is physically relevant. We have chosen the simplest form of the wave function (5) proportional to $\cos \theta$ as we assume that the backscattering is reasonably isotropic and this mode will give the leading contribution into the scattering probability.

The probability for an electron to be scattered to the 2DEG by the i th scattering center is equal to $P_i^\alpha = |A_i^\alpha|^2$. As the mean free path in the wire is quite large (experimentally it is of the order of $10^2 k_F^{-1}$) we conclude that in average the scattering centers are situated far away from each other and one can neglect interference between scattering waves created by different centers. Then the total probability for an electron to leave the edge state and to be scattered to the 2DEG at one of the impurities is just the sum of probabilities P_i :

$$P^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^N P_i^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^N |A_i^\alpha|^2. \quad (6)$$

We assume that all modes of edge states are *strongly coupled* to the 2DEG. This means that sooner or later an electron traveling along the edge is scattered into the 2DEG. Then for each edge mode the total probability $P^\alpha \approx 1$. We shall see that this implies the universal behavior of plateaus when temperature and bias voltage are varied.

We believe that at low temperatures and biases there is strong backscattering of electrons entering the 2DEG from the edge states which leads to a non-zero probability that an electron coherently re-enters the wire after having left it.

Assume that the mechanism of backscattering does not mix different edge channels. Then the correction to the contribution into conductance of the edge mode α is given by multiplying the universal factor of $2e^2/h$ by the transmission coefficient [2]:

$$G = 2 \frac{e^2}{h} t^\alpha. \quad (7)$$

In fact, the scattering at each center mixes different channels. Hence, the matrix describing return amplitude for an electron leaving some channel in the wire is not diagonal. In Born approximation the matrix of return amplitudes is anti-Hermitian and, therefore, can be diagonalized by a unitary transformation. After diagonalization the problem for N -channel edge looks as the problem of N independent channels.

In our model one can simplify the computation of transmission coefficients t^α . Let's introduce the return probability $r^\alpha = 1 - t^\alpha$. As we neglect interference between the incoming waves created by different scattering centers one can compute r^α as

$$r^\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^N r |A_i^\alpha|^2, \quad (8)$$

where r is the return probability for an electron injected into the 2DEG at some point at the boundary. It is reasonable to assume that r does not depend on the transversal structure of the wave function in the quantum well and, hence, is independent of α . By using equation (6) one easily sees that r^α is also α -independent. At low biases the value of the return probability coefficient r is completely determined by scattering of electrons in 2DEG at the Fermi surface of 2DEG. Hence, it should depend neither on the position of the Fermi level in 1DEG nor on the number of filled channels. This explains independence of the correction factor g of the number of filled channels as well as of their filling.

Let us mention that the value of r can strongly vary when the bias is increased as electrons enter 2DEG at higher energies. A similar phenomenon is observed in

measurements of tunneling conductivity, see e.g. [4] and is generally known as zero-bias anomaly. At present a number of different mechanisms responsible for zero-bias anomalies is known. In our opinion, the relevant mechanism is the anomalous enhancement of the backscattering of electrons entering 2DEG with a sharp edge due to the formation of Friedel oscillations of the electron density near the edge of 2DEG [5].

The variation of the density of 2DEG near its boundary is approximately given by summing contributions to the electron density by the single-electron states weighed with the Fermi-Dirac distribution function

$$n(x) = 4 \int \frac{dk_x}{2\pi} \frac{dk_y}{2\pi} \left(\sin^2(k_x x) - \frac{1}{2} \right) f(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu, T). \quad (9)$$

Here $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ is the kinetic energy of an electron with the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$, $f(\varepsilon - \mu, T)$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution at the chemical potential μ and the temperature T .

At low temperatures the density variation (9) is a slowly decaying oscillating function of x with the oscillation period π/k_F where k_F is the Fermi wave vector [5]:

$$n(x) \approx \frac{\sqrt{2}k_F^2}{\pi^{3/2}(2k_F x)^{3/2}} \sin\left(2k_F x + \frac{3\pi}{4}\right). \quad (10)$$

This is an asymptotic formula valid for large $k_F x$. Using formula (10) one can approximate the effective RPA scattering potential by the following local form

$$v(x) = (U(0) - U(2k_F))n(x), \quad (11)$$

where $U(q)$ is the Fourier transform of the RPA screened interaction potential. The term $U(0)$ in (11) is responsible for the exchange interaction whereas $U(2k_F)$ stands for the screened Coulomb potential. The oscillating character of the scattering potential (11) leads to anomalously enhanced backscattering of the electrons entering the 2DEG at energies close to the Fermi energy [5].

As the temperature is increased the oscillating tail of the density distribution becomes suppressed at the distances higher than

$$l_T \sim \frac{1}{k_F} \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_F}{T}},$$

where ε_F is the Fermi energy. Consequently, the anomaly in the backscattering amplitude diminishes at higher temperatures.

The RPA expression for $U(q)$ is

$$U(q) = U_0(q) \frac{1}{1 + \Pi(q)U_0(q)}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$U_0(q) = \frac{2\pi e^2}{\epsilon|q|} \quad (13)$$

is the 2-dimensional Fourier transform of the Coulomb potential, $\epsilon \approx 10$ is the dielectric constant of AlGaAs. The RPA polarization operator $\Pi(q)$ of 2DEG at $q = 0$ is equal to

$$\Pi(0) = \frac{m^*}{2\pi\hbar^2}, \quad (14)$$

where m^* is the effective mass of an electron [7]. $\Pi(q)$ continuously decreases with growing $|q|$. A simple estimate shows that in the experiment of Yacoby *et al.* $\Pi(2k_F)U_0(2k_F) \leq \Pi(0)U_0(2k_F) = e^2 k_F / (4\epsilon\varepsilon_F) \approx 0.3$. Hence, the exchange contribution is dominating.

Now let us estimate the order of magnitude of the probability that an electron coherently re-enters the wire due to backscattering on Friedel oscillations at zero temperature. In the Born approximation the return probability is given by

$$1 - t = r = \frac{1}{(\hbar v)^2} |\langle \text{out} | V | \text{in} \rangle|^2, \quad (15)$$

where the wave function ψ_{out} is obtained by time reversal (complex conjugation) from the wave function ψ_{in} of an electron entering the 2DEG from the wire, v is the velocity of the incoming electron. As we expect that the effect comes from the distances of the order of several $1/k_F$, we can replace the exact wave function ψ_{in} by its asymptotic form (5).

As the effect is expected to be maximal for electrons at Fermi energy of 2DEG, we compute the probability for $p = k_F$. Taking into account formulas (5), (10), (11) and (15) we obtain the following expression for the probability r :

$$r_0 = \kappa \left(\frac{n_0}{\pi\varepsilon_F} (U(0) - U(2k_F)) \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

where κ is a coefficient close to 1. Let us remark that instead of the linear dependence of the reflection coefficient on the interaction potential derived in the work [5] formula (16) predicts quadratic dependence. The difference is due to the fact that in our model the transmission coefficient is equal to 1 to the zeroth order in scattering potential whereas in the context of [5] the transmission is weak.

Substituting expressions (12), (13) and (14) into formula (16) one gets

$$r_0 = \frac{4\kappa}{\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{\Pi(0)U_0(2k_F)}{1 + \Pi(2k_F)U_0(2k_F)} \right)^2. \quad (17)$$

Let us remark that in the regime when $\Pi(0)U_0(2k_F)$ is small the value of r_0 is not very sensitive to parameters of the problem. If one neglects $\Pi(0)U_0(2k_F)$ one gets a universal result $r_0 = 4\kappa/\pi^2 \approx 0.4$. Note, however, that for so high a return probability the Born approximation would not be reliable anymore.

For the values of the electron density $n_0 = (1 \div 2) \times 10^{11} \text{cm}^{-2}$ and of the Fermi energy $\varepsilon_F = 10 \text{meV}$ of the 2DEG in experiments [1] one gets $r_0 \approx 0.2$. This is in a good agreement with experimental values of $r_{\text{exp}} = (10 \div 25) \times 10^{-2}$. Let us remark that our estimate is based on the assumption that the screening of the potential is purely 2-dimensional. This assumption is true if the wave length of the Friedel oscillations π/k_F is much greater than the width of the quantum well. In experiments of Yacoby *et al.* $\pi/k_F \approx (25 \div 40) \text{nm}$ whereas the width of the well varies from 14nm to 40nm. The largest deviation in conductance is observed for thin wells $r_{\text{exp}} = (20 \div 25) \times 10^{-2}$ and it decreases when the well width grows to $r_{\text{exp}} \approx 10 \times 10^{-2}$. We think that this may happen due to cross-over from purely 2-dimensional to 3-dimensional behavior.

Analysis of the dependence of the reflection coefficient r on the bias shows that for strong biases $V \sim \varepsilon_F$ the asymptotic of r is given by

$$r(V) \sim (\varepsilon_F + V)^{-3/2}. \quad (18)$$

Numerical analysis shows that this asymptotic expression works well for $V > 0.3\varepsilon_F$. Below this value the reflection coefficient grows sharply as the bias approaches zero and reaches the finite value r_0 at $V = 0$.

There are two different factors which make the conductivity temperature dependent. First, the reflection coefficient decreases when temperature is increased because the Friedel oscillations are suppressed at high temperatures. This dependence can be approximated by exponential:

$$r(T) \sim e^{-\alpha T/\varepsilon_F}, \quad (19)$$

where α is a coefficient numerically found to be of order 1. We expect α to be sensitive to the electron density distribution near the edge. Second, at finite temperatures the conductivity is related to the transmission coefficient $t = 1 - r(V, T)$ via

$$G = 2 \frac{e^2}{h} \int d\varepsilon t(\varepsilon - \mu, T) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} f(\varepsilon - \mu, T). \quad (20)$$

As temperature in experiments [1] is always very small in comparison to the Fermi energy ($T \sim (1 \div 20) \text{K}$, $\varepsilon_F \sim 10 \text{mV}$) one can approximate the dependence of t on the bias V by several first terms of the Taylor expansion. As $r(V, T)$ has a maximum at $V = 0$ and behaves smoothly at finite T , the linear term in the Taylor expansion vanishes. The higher order terms result in the contributions to $G(T)$ proportional to the powers of T higher than 1 and can therefore be neglected in view of the exponential suppression of $r(T)$ (19):

$$G(T) \approx 2 \frac{e^2}{h} \left(1 - r_0 e^{-\alpha T/\varepsilon_F} \right). \quad (21)$$

This dependence of $G(T)$ is qualitatively similar to the one obtained in experiments [1].

The authors are grateful to J.Fröhlich, D.Maslov, T.M.Rice, A.Rodina and A.Yacoby for useful discussions and comments. One of the authors (V.C.) thanks ETH, Zürich for hospitality.

-
- [1] A.Yacoby et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4612 (1996).
 - [2] R.Landauer, Philos. Mag. **21** 863 (1970);
M.Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1761 (1986).
 - [3] D.L.Maslov and M.Stone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R5539 (1995);
V.V.Ponomarenko, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R8666 (1995);
I.Safi and H.J.Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R17040 (1995);
A.Kawabata, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **65**, 30 (1996).
 - [4] R.C.Ashoori et al. Phys. Rev. B **48**, 4616 (1993).
 - [5] L.Shekhtman and L.I.Glazman, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R2297 (1995).
 - [6] C.L.Kane and M.P.A.Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **46** 15233 (1992).
 - [7] B.I.Halperin, P.A.Lee and N.Read, Phys. Rev. B **47** 7312 (1993).